



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/928,962

08/13/2001

Shamim A. Alpha

27252.4

8752

7590

04/01/2004

Petar Kraguljac
Benesch, Fiedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP
2300 BP Tower
200 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114-2378

EXAMINER

VEILLARD, JACQUES

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/928,962

Applicant(s)

ALPHA, SHAMIM A.

Examiner

Jacques Veillard

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's amendment filed on 1/7/2004.
2. Claims 1, 9, 15, 25 have been amended and claim 26 added.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 filed on 1/7/2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chakrabarti et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,418,433 and hereinafter Chakrabarti).

As per claim 1, Chakrabarti discloses a web crawler method learns to recognize web pages that are relevant to the interest of one or more users (See the Title and the abstract).

Similarly Chakrabarti's method determines a relevance rank for each of a plurality of pages

identified by a search query (See col.2, lines 56-60), and comprising the steps of: determining a content-based relevance rank for each of the pages based on a content of each page (See col.3, lines 6-12); and adjusting the content-based relevance rank for a selected page from the plurality of pages based on a link structure of the pages including link rank values from in-coming links (See Fig.2, components 112-118, col.6, lines 16-35, and col.8, lines 35-41) where the link rank values are determined from distributed values of content-based relevance from one or more pages that point to the selected page (See col.7, lines 3-41) Chakrabarti showed in these passages the adjusting of a content-based relevance rank of a selected page by determine "relevance priority of the pages".

As per claim 9, the claim has substantially the same limitations as claim 1. These limitations have already been addressed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given to the rejected claim 1 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-8 and 10-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claims 15-26 are allowed.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest: a) a method wherein the

content-based relevance rank for each page is determined from a probability value that a user will be on the page in relation to other pages of the identified pages as recited in claim 2.

b) a method including determining the link rank value for each out-going link from an associated page based on a probability of leaving the associated page as recite in claim 3.

c) a method for determining the link rank value step includes distributing the probability of leaving the associated page to all out-going links of the associated page weighted by the content-based relevance rank of a page referenced by the out-going link as recited in claim 4.

d) a method for translating the content-based relevance rank for each page to a staying probability value representing a probability that a user will stay on a page as recited in claim 6.

e) a system including link structure logic for obtaining a link structure of the candidate set of pages to determine in-coming and out-going page links as recited in claim 10.

f) a system including a probability logic for determining a staying probability for each page being a probability that a user will stay on a given page, and for determining a leaving probability for each page being a probability that a user will leave a given page as recited in claim 11..

g) a system where the link analysis rank for an out-going page link from a selected page represents a probability that a user will follow the out-going page link from the selected page as recited in claim 12, and

h) a system wherein the link analysis logic further includes logic for distributing the leaving probability for the selected page to the out-going page links based on a ratio of the content-based relevance rank of child pages referred to by the out-going page links as recited in claim 13.

9. Regarding independent claims 15 and 26, the prior art taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest a method or system wherein the link ranking for a selected page representing a probability of leaving the selected page by the out-going link; and a relevance rank adjuster for determining and adjusting a relevance rank of a page by combining the content relevance rank with the link rankings associated to in-coming links for the page in combination with the other limitations of the claims were not disclosed by, would riot have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the specification are also allowed.

10. Regarding independent claims 20 and 25, the prior art taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest a method or system wherein the adjusting includes determining, for each candidate page, a probability of a user being on a page in relation to all candidate pages, the probability of a user being on a page being set as the adjusted content-based relevance rank for that page in combination with the other limitations of the claims were not disclosed by, would riot have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the specification are also allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any response to this action should be mail to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal of draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor Lobby (Receptionist Telephone No. (703) 305-3900).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (703) 305-7094. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 4: 30 PM.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5403.

J.V.

Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

March 31, 2004.

Charles Rones
CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER